FML

ANGLICAN PREJUDICES

AGAINST THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

LONDON:

BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17, 18 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

ANGLICAN PREJUDICES

AGAINST THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

by Lady Elizabeth Herbert, of Lea

LONDON:
BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17, 18 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

[1866]

This Letter was written by an Anglican Convert to her Brother, before her reception into the Church.

Many things might, perhaps, have been differently expressed, had she written it now. But she thought it would be a fairer view of the state of mind in which many High-Church Anglicans at this moment are, if she were to print it exactly as it was, leaving out merely the names of persons and places. If it ever should be of the slightest use to any doubting soul, her end will be attained. But the venture must be made in faith. It is only when the step is taken, that the full light bursts upon the soul, the scales seem to fall from one's eyes, and one realises the eternal truth of the One Holy Catholic and Roman Church. Then argument is needed no longer. In the words of one himself a convert, she feels: "I know only one fear,—the fear that my heart may be faithless to Him who has bestowed on me this unspeakable blessing. I know only one mystery,—the mystery of that calling which brought *me* into this home of rest, while millions are still driven to and fro in the turbulent ocean of the world, without rudder and without compass, without helmsman and without anchor, to drift before the gale upon the fatal shores."

ANGLICAN PREJUDICES

AGAINST THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE READING OF THE BIBLE.

I WISH to say a few words as to the popular beliefs regarding Romanism, which I had imbibed from my youth up, but which I have found simply overturned one by one. It is very difficult to approach this subject even with one's nearest and dearest relations. In England, Protestantism is synonymous with good sense, and Catholicism with weakness of mind, fanaticism, or some unaccountable delusion. No conceivable absurdities can surpass the absurdities which are believed of Catholics by sensible, kind-hearted, liberal English men and women—liberal, I mean, on every other point but this. Their ideas are taken from a kind of tradition, not authenticated, but immemorial. They have been taught these notions in the nursery, in the schoolroom, at college, in the newspapers, in society. Dr. Newman, in a clever little book which he published in 1855 on the position of Catholics in England, attributes this state of things to two causes: the first, that from the time of Queen Elizabeth the whole *literature* of England fell into Protestant hands; the second, that English Protestantism became the religion of the throne. It is, in fact, religion grafted upon loyalty, and consists "in backing-up the Queen, whom men see, against a Pope, whom they do not see." The consequence is natural. Tell a person of ordinary intelligence that a well-educated Protestant can find peace and satisfaction in the Catholic Church, and he will simply not believe it. He will talk to you of the "monstrous errors" and "childish absurdities" of the Romish Church; he "knows all about it"—"far better," as poor Lady Granville used to say, "than we do ourselves." He will dilate on the horrors of "bloody Mary's" reign. He knows nothing of the equal horrors perpetrated in Queen Elizabeth's. He has never read the Acts of Parliament passed during that reign against the Catholics, which make one marvel that any single Catholic remained in England. He has never looked at the trial of Lord

Scrope, who was accused of "recusancy" because, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, he had *only* imprisoned and tortured *sixteen hundred and seventy* Catholics. He knows as little of the religious ideas and religious motives of *two hundred millions* of his fellow-Christians as if they lived in the moon. He forgets that the forefathers of whom he is so proud—the "brave Saxons" and "Normans," "good King Alfred," "brave Richard Cœur de Lion," "upright Sir Thomas More," and all the rest of his heroes—were of the old Faith. "Can any good come out of Nazareth?" With the feeling which characterises John Bull all over the world, he believes he is right and every one else wrong. It is hopeless to argue against such prejudice and one-sidedness. But as the effect of early teaching for a long time blinded my own eyes to simple facts, I am going now to enumerate these untruths one by one, and show you how they were disproved to my own satisfaction.

And first as to the *Reading of the Bible.* I firmly believed for at least half my life that it was forbidden to Catholics. This had been the foundation of *Father Clement* and half the popular story-books which one had read against the Church of Rome. One day the English Bible I always take with me in travelling was lost. I went to a bookseller's, and found a Douay version. In the Preface I came upon the following letter of Pope Pius VI. to the English Translator in 1778: "At a time when a vast number of bad books are circulated among the unlearned . . . . . you have judged exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the abundant sources which *ought to be left open to every one,* to draw from them purity of doctrine and of morals, and to eradicate error. . . . . This you have seasonably effected by publishing the sacred writings *in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity,*" &c.

Again, in reading the Fathers of the Church, I find that St. Jerome, St. Cyril, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and countless others, lay down the study of the Holy Scriptures as of the first importance. St. Isidore speaks of "the sacred volumes as the steps whereby we ascend to God." But if it be objected that in later ages this opinion lost weight, turn to St. Bernard, who in his sermons continually urges on his hearers to draw from the sacred text "a substantial and strengthening nourishment," "which shall be as honey in the wax and marrow in the bone." St. Charles Borromeo, St. John of the Cross, St. François de

Sales, and a host of other Saints, insist on the same point. In the daily life of Catholics in our day the same rule is observed. I once asked a young Catholic lady, with whom I shared a cabin on my return from the East, "if her confessor were very severe with her." She replied: "Oh, no; he is very kind and indulgent. He only insists on one thing; and that is, that I should read some verses of the Bible every day." I had ocular testimony that she always kept to this rule. The first thing almost that * * * * asked me when I first came back to him in confession in 1863 was: "Have you kept the injunction I laid upon you, never to omit reading some portion of Holy Scripture daily?" So rooted is prejudice in the human mind, that I confess this question surprised me. I thought he would have changed on that point. I have seen a good deal of the teaching in Catholic schools during the last three or four years, and I can honestly say I have found the children as well versed in the history and meaning of the Bible as my own Park-School children. In the daily Eucharistic service there is a gospel and epistle for each day in the year. In the place where I now am these are read first in Latin and then in the language of the country; so that those who cannot read, hear the Bible daily, and those who can, find it in their Missals. Besides this, the Catholic Church makes meditation on Holy Scripture, its words as well as its substance, a part of every Christian's daily duty. All their Occasional Services, their Via Crucis, their Rosary, their Litanies, what are they but a string of meditations on the Passion, the Life, or the Resurrection of our divine Lord? The effect of this is to impress a knowledge of the *substance* of Scripture even upon the unlettered, far more deep and living and real than the poor among Protestants generally have who read their Bibles daily. At least this has struck me in going among the Catholic poor abroad, and contrasting them with those in England. But before leaving this subject, and as an instance of the way in which rash assertions are made, I will mention a little circumstance which occurred when we were in Egypt. Miss Whately, daughter of the late Archbishop of Dublin, had settled in Cairo and set up a school, which, from various causes, has failed. She attributed this failure mainly to the Roman-Catholic Sisters, who had "seduced away" the children; and in her book entitled *Ragged Life in Egypt* she talks of this, lamenting the fact, and adding: "Thus these poor little ones will never hear again the Gospel—the Word of Life," &c.,

and a good deal to the same effect. (I cannot be sure of the exact words, as I have not the book with me.) Well, one day at dinner at Mr. * * *'s, where there was a large party of English, this book was discussed. Every one had read it, and every one spoke of this particular part of it, exclaiming: "How sad it is!" "You see Rome is just the same all over the world," &c. I ventured at last to say: "But are you sure the assertion is true that they never read the Gospel in the Catholic school?" I was answered by an indignant chorus of "Oh, yes! Miss Whately has been here for years, and *knows all about it.*" Now, what were the *facts?* Miss Whately had never been in the Sisters' School, nor had any one of the ladies who were discussing the matter. I had been constantly, and that very day had heard what we should call a "Bible Class" on the 1st chapter of St. Matthew, when the children were learning in French and Arabic the history of the Incarnation and Birth of our Saviour, so as to know it perfectly by Christmas. It was of no use my saying this. If I had, the company would simply have looked askance at me, and whispered, "that they were sure Lady H. was more than half a Catholic herself." It would have had no effect on their preconceived prejudices. None of them would have taken the trouble to go and judge for themselves; they would not have liked the dirty cut-throat-looking back-streets which led to the Convent. And there *the lie sticks.* Every one reads Miss Whately's book when they come to Cairo. In the first place it is "nice light reading;" then it is in English, and most of our countrymen and women are lamentably ignorant of any other tongue; and every one who reads it carries away with him, insensibly as it were, a fresh impression of the "terrible sin" of that Church which "shuts out the Gospel from the people." *The lie has done its work.* They will forget by and by Miss Whately and her book, but the conviction will remain. They will forget how or by what process they received it; but *there it is* in their minds, clear and indelible. And I have dwelt so long upon this trivial story in this first paper because it is a sample of the way in which every thing Catholic is judged in England. This kind of loose talk and reckless assertion among women fixes a stain which is continually deepening in the minds of those exposed to its influence. I know nothing so hopeless as the prejudices thus engendered; and therefore, even while taking the trouble to write all this, I feel it is "kicking against the pricks," unless God will be pleased to open people's eyes and induce them to bring to the consideration of the subject the same fairness, honesty, and impartiality which distinguish Englishmen on every other point but religion. To sum up, therefore, the subject of the Scriptures, I have come to the conclusion that the charge of "keeping back the Bible" is a lie, and that the Catholic Church, by its living and perpetual worship, leads her children into habitual union with the divine objects of faith, and with the realities of our divine Lord's presence, of which the Holy Scriptures are the *record*, but not the *reality*.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

I believed for years that Catholics either omitted altogether, or garbled or altered, the Second Commandment, which was a standing protest against the "worship of images." The simple fact is, that their commandments are *identical* with ours, only that they put the first and second together, and divide the tenth. But as to this very "worship" of images, as the Protestants call it. It is no more "worship" than my feeling towards my husband is worship. I have his picture in my room; I wear it on my breast; I love to keep up the remembrance of his presence in every way. And in the same manner, and with the same feeling, I wear a crucifix, hidden from all eyes like his picture. I love to have one in my room to help me to realise the wonderful mystery of His suffering and His love; to have before me the representation and image of Him "who bore our griefs and carried our sorrows," and who has been ever since my widowhood the only one who could fill up the aching void in my heart. The difference in my feelings since I became a Catholic is this: formerly I believed in Jesus and loved Him as an abstraction of faith; now I seem to have a more intimate personal love of Him; a something tangible, the worship and adoration of which, whether in the Blessed Sacrament on the altar, or kneeling before the crucifix in my own room, gives me inexpressible comfort and peace. It is only that the representation brings the substance more clearly before you, and that one loves to have such a representation of the object loved. This, it appears to me, is the real and only reason of pictures and crucifixes in churches, and is clearly so understood by those who use them. St. Jerome says: "As, therefore, the Jews venerated the Ark of the Covenant, and the two images of gold of the

Cherubim, though it was nowhere permitted of God that these things should be worshiped, so neither do we Christians *worship the crucifix as God*, but as showing the sincere affection of our souls towards Him that was crucified." I will conclude this paper with the words of Dr. Arnold, in a letter to Mr. Hull, quoted in Dean Stanley's *Life*, and giving, therefore, the views of even Protestants on this head: "The Second Commandment is, in the letter, utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse, then, the benefit which we might derive from the frequent use of the crucifix, under pretence of the Second Commandment, is a folly; because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself when He declared Himself in the person of Christ."

THE EUCHARIST.

Regarding the Holy Communion, I think there is little difference between the Catholic belief and that held by most High-Church Anglicans of the present day. No one amongst them now denies the *real Presence* in this Sacrament. No one dares to receive the words of the Catechism in a non-natural sense. But I have found in the writings of the early Fathers the clearest possible evidence of this mystery. I find that in the very first century St. Ignatius, speaking of certain heretics, writes: "they abstain from the Eucharist because they will not believe that the Eucharist is the actual Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that Flesh which suffered for our sins, and which the Father raised again. *They, therefore, who deny this gift of God, perish in their disputing.*" All the subsequent Fathers hold the same doctrine. But skipping over what is too long for my purpose, I will quote two passages from St. Ambrose and St. Augustine.

"The Jews exclaimed: 'How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?' Human understanding rejects as false what exceeds its comprehension. You ask: 'How can you prove to me that I shall receive the Body of Christ?' I will prove that the force of benediction is greater than the force of nature. Moses held a rod: he cast it down, and it became a serpent. Again, he took hold of the tail of the serpent, and it returned to the nature of the rod. See, then, that by grace the nature both of serpent and rod was twice changed." After quoting the waters of Marah, the Jordan, and the miracles of Elisha, he goes on: "Now if the word of Elias so availed, *shall not the word of Christ be* *of avail to change the nature and species of the elements?* He spoke, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created. . . . . . But let us establish the verity of the mystery by the Incarnation. Did not the Virgin conceive contrary to nature? Why seekest thou, then, the order of nature in the Body of Christ, when the Lord Jesus Himself was, contrary to nature, born of a Virgin? Real, in truth, was Christ's Flesh that was crucified." So far St. Ambrose. Now St. Augustine: "The Lord Jesus Himself says, 'This is My Body.' *Before* the Benediction another species is named; *after*, His Body is signified. It is the same with His Blood. And thou sayest 'Amen!' What the mouth speaks, let the inward man confess." And again: "We also are fed from the Cross of Christ, because we eat His Body."

St. Cyril says: "Our Lord omits to tell the Jews in what way He will give them His Flesh to eat, *declaring that they must believe before inquiring.*"

The result of all I have read, therefore, is to convince me that in the Holy Communion there is truly and actually contained the Body and Blood of Christ; the *substance* being changed, though the *species* remains, by the power and will of God.

But it was some time before I could reconcile myself to the idea of receiving it only under *one kind.* For the first twelve centuries both were administered to the laity; and Bossuet, in an earnest appeal to the Pope, urges the restoration of the practice. But that this appeal was not granted was in consequence of a heresy which had been promulgated, that Christ did not exist whole under one species. Both are essential to the *sacrifice,* which is representative of the crucifixion and death of our divine Lord; but either is sufficient for *communion* in the sacrifice. It mattered not what part of the Paschal Lamb each might receive; he who received any part was partaker of the whole sacrifice: much more in the true Lamb, who is a living sacrifice, with whom and in whom we communicate as life with life, not in a separated and fragmentary manner, but as one living and indivisible person. The Greeks, who give communion in both kinds, nevertheless send communion to the sick only in *one,* proving their belief that whoever receives under one kind becomes truly partaker of the whole Sacrament. The words of our Lord, "Do this in remembrance of Me," are literally fulfilled in the celebration of the holy sacrifice. There is no command to communicate in both except for the priest. No Catholic has ever spoken of communion in one kind as mutilated *communion;* but a mutilated *sacrifice* it would be.

Pope Leo and Pope Gelasius ordered, on the other hand, that those who refused the chalice out of Manichean and heretical errors, should receive it; as the Church would now, if the same errors arose again. The heretics, who lost the true doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, were, as I have said before, the main cause of the denial of the cup to the laity. It was to correct their carnal and material view that the Church, in the Council of Lateran, decreed that communion should be given only in one kind. I feel now, therefore, that in receiving it thus, I should be deprived of no grace necessary to salvation. This idea of a separate partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ is, in truth, *unreal;* for though the *signs* may be separated, the *thing signified, i. e.* the Body and Blood of our incarnate Saviour, cannot be.

While still hoping, therefore, that the day may come when the cup may be restored to us, I shall be quite content to receive it as the Church has ordained.

I come now to the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. One day this subject was discussed among several clergy, some of whom lamented the discontinuance of the practice in the Anglican Church; but they were met by the usual answer, that it was an "innovation," "Roman," and "new." Now I find proofs of it in the second century, in Tertullian; in the third, in St. Cyprian; in the fourth, in St. Chrysostom and St. Paulinus; and so on. It used to be reserved in private houses in the time of persecution; but when the Church had peace, the reservation was restricted to the churches, as the common home of Christians. St. Paulinus mentions that there were often two tabernacles side by side: "One for the Blessed Sacrament, the Word Incarnate;" the other for the Holy Scriptures, the "Word Written." The whole Greek Church has practised it from a high antiquity; so, I think, have the Nestorians, Copts, and all Oriental Churches. It is a curious fact, that the Churches which "reserve" believe in and worship Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament; and the Church which has rejected it has lost both the adoration and the faith in the Blessed Eucharist. Who can deny the effect on the human mind of the "little light" telling of the perpetual presence? Who does not feel chilled in entering the finest of our Anglican cathedrals where it is absent? I have already spoken of the intense comfort that the Benediction service has all along been to me.

It made me a Catholic long before I knew it. It is one of the most beautiful, soothing, and natural actions of the Church. It is our Lord's solemn benediction to His people, as when He lifted up His hands over the children of Israel, or when He blessed His chosen ones when He ascended up from the Mount of Olives. As children come before their parents before going to bed at night, so does the great Catholic family come before the Eternal Father, after the bustle and toil of the day, to ask for His blessing; and "He smiles on them and sheds upon them the light of His countenance." How often have I felt in London, coming, in "the season," out of the crowd and turmoil of Regent and Oxford Street, the blessing and calm of that service in Harley House, "whilst outside the anger of the strong is like a whirlwind beating against the wall"! I say nothing of what the habitual nearness of the Blessed Sacrament does for us, or of the mystical connection which it bears to His sacred infancy and His descent from the cross. The love of the Blessed Sacrament is ever increasing, is daily and life-long. In stillness, in reverence, in heartfelt awe and worship, we kneel before the tabernacle; we pour out before Him our hopes, our wishes, our fears; and it is rarely, if ever, that we do not return home comforted, strengthened, and refreshed by the benediction which He is ever ready to pour out on those who thus seek Him daily in faith and hope and love.

With heart and soul, then, do I daily repeat the words in the "divine praises" said after the Mass: "*Blessed* be Jesus in the most holy Sacrament of the Altar!"

CONFESSION. INDULGENCES.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say much on the subject of confession. It is recognised as a necessary means of grace among most High-Church Anglicans. But it having been asserted to me by an Anglican Bishop that it was not practised by the Church in the first three or four centuries, I took pains to ascertain the fact, and found such a mass of authority *against* this statement, that it is impossible for me to quote more than one or two. Tertullian, Origen, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Cyprian, St. Cyril, and, in the fifth century, St. Augustine, are unanimous in their expression of opinion on this head. A Father, writing in the fourth century, says: "God alone, you say, can forgive sins. True. But *that which He does through His priest is His own power.*" St. Ambrose, speaking to a penitent, as in God's name, exclaims: "Wilt thou plead shame that thou didst not confess to my priest? *I gave a remedy; why didst thou refuse it?*" Again, St. Athanasius: "He who confesses with penitence receives *through the priest,* by the grace of Christ, the remission of his sins." But I am quite content to pin my faith on St. Augustine. He exclaims: "Believe and confess. Let no one say to himself: 'I do it in secret. I do it before God. God (may He pardon me!) knows that I do it to Him in my heart.' Was it then said *without cause,* 'What ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven'? *Without cause* do ye imagine are the keys given to the Church of God? Will ye make void the words of Christ?" and so on, in an indignant protest. Again, speaking of the words of Christ, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, ... whosesoever sins ye remit," &c., he says: "For to what purpose was this power given if it imposed not on men the obligation of making known their sins? or how could this power be exercised if no sins were communicated?"

I do not dwell on the absurd allegations of certain Protestants, that absolution is given "beforehand," that you may thus obtain a license to sin, and that there is a kind of tariff for big and little sins—the latter, *moyennant* a few "aves," being allowed to be committed with impunity; that on the church-doors are fixed a catalogue of sins, with a specification of the prices at which remission of each might severally be obtained. If I had not heard members of my own family make such assertions, I should be ashamed to write them down. As it is, I will only say that it is *utterly false* to assert that the Catholic Church has ever held the doctrine that the perpetration of crime could be "indulged" for any sum of money; and that being a sacrament, it cannot be bought without horrible sacrilege. Every Catholic child knows that without heartfelt penitence towards God, and a firm resolution to amend, no absolution is ever given, or, if given, would be invalid. I do not for a moment imagine that this Sacrament has never been abused or used for bad and vile purposes. But so have the holiest rites. The *abuse* of a good thing does not make the thing itself bad. But take confession *as it is in fact*—as those can bear witness who know it by experience, and, as Dr. Newman says, "No other ordinance of the Church is so helpful, so soothing, or so full of blessing."

And connected with this subject, and with the absolution given to penitents, is the question of *Indulgence.*

Nothing shocks English people more than this word. It is connected in their minds with all the abuses and evils which may have undoubtedly existed in some places in the time of Luther and of the Reformation. I will try and write down here what I believe to be the real Catholic doctrine regarding it.

1. We know that by the vicarious sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ the sin of the world has been taken away.
2. That the penitent claims the benefits of His Death and Passion to remove not only the guilt, but the consequences of sin.
3. That the consequences of sin are twofold—eternal and temporal.
4. That in absolving sinners who are truly penitent from the eternal punishment of sin, the Church inflicts temporal punishment or penance.
5. The Church has equally the power to mitigate or "indulge" these temporal punishments; and this is what is called an *Indulgence,* the remission of eternal guilt being called *Absolution.*

David is a direct instance of what I mean.

He *confessed* his sin to Nathan. Nathan *absolved* him—"The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die," &c. Nevertheless, the *temporal* punishment was inflicted in the death of his child, and not remitted till after long penance or "*satisfaction.*"

Now thus far I do not think there can be any difficulty to any one who believes, with St. Augustine, in the words of our Lord: "Whosesoever sins ye remit," &c.

But the doctrine of Indulgences goes further than this. "If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged of the Lord." If we humble and chasten our own souls, He will spare us. If we will not, He will chasten us, "that we be not condemned with the world." And knowing the sinfulness of our hearts and lives, and the vast chastisement necessary for our purification, even after full pardon or "*absolution*" from the mouth of His ministers, we believe that, either in this world or in the world unseen, we must be purified through a discipline of some sort. This discipline, whether laid on ourselves by ourselves, or laid upon us by God, is *penance*. But if, through fervour of repentance, any soul takes upon itself a voluntary discipline of chastisement, the Church has power to assure the penitent of God's "*indul-*

gence." In a word, the *guilt* of sin is not remitted by what is called an "*indulgence,*" but the *temporal punishment*, or such a portion of it as, in the order of divine justice, may remain due after the guilt has been remitted. There remain points relating to the unseen world, and to the participation of all members of Christ's Body in the "satisfaction" of His martyrs and servants, upon which I will not now enter. What I have said is the whole *doctrine* of the Catholic Church as regards indulgences; and to one who believes, as I do, in the absolution of her ministers, it offers no difficulty.

PURGATORY AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

Catholics hold that there is an intermediate state, where souls, to whom remission from eternal pain is given, are yet liable to some temporal punishment, and that such souls are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on earth.

There is no doubt that prayers for the dead were always in use among the Jews; and Jeremy Taylor remarks upon this, that our Saviour "never condemned the practice." There is also no doubt that such prayers were used from the earliest times in the Christian Church; which at once leads to the conclusion that they were considered needful for the departed; as, if they were happy, why should they need our prayers and offerings?

Tertullian, speaking of a wife, says: "Therefore doth she pray for his soul, and begs for him, *in the interim*, refreshment, light, and peace." Again, St. Cyril: "Thus do we plead on behalf of all who have already fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great assistance to their souls, for which the most holy and awful Sacrifice is offered." Again, St. Ephrem exclaims: "Let us pray distinctly and by name for each brother or sister that departeth from us. Let us supplicate the Judge, who hearkens to the prayers of those that love Him." And then follow seventy or eighty prayers for their deliverance from suffering. Again, St. Chrysostom says: "Not in vain are oblations made on behalf of the departed; not in vain, supplications; not in vain, alms; nor in vain have these things been ordained by law by the Apostles, that prayers and commemorations of the departed take place at the awful mysteries. They knew that much gain accrues to them and great assistance."

St. Augustine, in his beautiful prayer for his mother Monica (who had implored him, when she was dying, to "remember her daily at the altar of the Lord, wherever he might be"), pleads with God for forgiveness of her sins, and the shortening of her time of probation, in words of touching earnestness. In writing to Laurentius, also, he says: "*Nor is it to be denied by any one that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their living friends.*" St. Paulinus says: "In the Book of Machabees we read that sacrifice was offered for the dead; and the *authority of the Universal Church in this practice is clear*, since in the prayers of the priests, poured forth to the Lord God at His altar, the recommendation of the departed has its appointed place."

But it is useless for me to multiply extracts, or to show how such prayers have a place in every Liturgy except the Anglican. It is enough for me that such authorities sanction and encourage the practice, and believe in its necessity, even if no feeling in my own heart urged me to plead incessantly for my husband and father in the beautiful words of the Church: "Requiem æternam dona ei, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat ei." "Fidelium animæ, per misericordiam Dei, requiescant in pace. Amen."

THE DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

And now to come to the point which is, and ever must be, the great difficulty with all Anglicans. Talk to an Englishman about Popery, and in five minutes he will come to the "blasphemous *new* doctrine of the Immaculate Conception," and wonder what the Church of Rome will "develop next." But here, again, I found that the ideas I had previously conceived as to the Catholic belief in the matter were entirely erroneous. That any soul in the Catholic Church worships her as *God*, I simply and invincibly disbelieve. They put her in the exact position of *Eve before the fall.* They argue that our Saviour could not have been born of one less pure than was the first mother of our race; and with this view agree all the early Fathers. Even the Protestant Bishop Hall, in his work entitled *No Peace with Rome*, exclaimed, "O blessed Mary! he cannot honour thee too much who deifies thee not." Martin Luther says of her, in his famous sermon on her conception: "The Virgin Mary holds as it were a middle position between Christ and man; for in the first moment she began to live she was exempt from all sin." "For it could not be said to her by the angel

Gabriel, '*Blessed* art thou among women,' if at any time she had been obnoxious to the curse." But let us return to the first days of Christianity. I find in some Acts, said to contain the profession of faith of St. Andrew before his martyrdom, these words: "Because the first man was created of immaculate earth, it was necessary that the perfect man should be born of an *immaculate* virgin." The celebrated comparison between Eve, while yet immaculate and incorrupt, and the Blessed Virgin, is drawn out and enlarged upon by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Justin, St. Cyril, St. Epiphanius, St. Hippolytus, Origen, St. Ephrem, St. Anselm, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and a mass of other Fathers from the first to the fifth centuries. No controversy on the point seems, in fact, to have arisen till the twelfth century. The festival of the "Immaculate Conception" had been established in the East from the earliest times, and in the West in the seventh century, but not authoritatively from Rome. Then came discussions on the question of "whether her innocence began at the moment of her conception or at that of her birth;" and St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and others, hotly contested the point. None of these Fathers ever implied a doubt of her being *exempt from original sin*. They believed that she was, as it were, the first-fruits of the redemption; and that by a new kind of sanctification, the Holy Spirit had preserved her immaculate, to be a fitting temple for her divine Son. In 1497 the University of Paris proclaimed the doctrine by statute, and their example was followed by most of the other European Universities. I had been told that the Dominican Order had from the first opposed it; but that, again, I found was an exaggerated assertion. St. Dominic himself wrote a book in defence of it, in answer to the Albigenses. From their *Book of Hours*, printed in 1529, for the use of the Dominican Order, you will find Prayers and Hymns addressed to the Virgin as "conceived without stain," and "so lovingly preserved in her Immaculate Conception," and the like. The feast was celebrated by them as early as 1387. Pope Pius V. inserted the Office in the Breviary and the Mass in the Missal in 1546, and made it a feast of obligation. I have dwelt so long on this point because, for many years, I fancied that this doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" was a new dogma, invented by the present Pope; whereas thirty-three Popes before him had sanctioned and encouraged the devotion, which was first decreed by Sixtus IV. in 1476. All that the present Pope has done has been to define and proclaim that doctrine which the Catholic Church had for so many centuries believed. Dr. Newman on this point, in his *Apologia*, says: "Be large-minded enough to believe that men may reason and feel very differently from yourselves; that we have no intellectual difficulty in that in particular which you call a 'novelty' of this day. . . . . . Indeed, it is a simple fact to say that Catholics have not come to believe it because it is defined, but *it was defined because they believed it.*"

But now as to the "cultus" of the Blessed Virgin. Dr. Newman says it was "his great crux as regards Catholicism;" and I confess it has been one of my greatest difficulties. The intervention of the Blessed Virgin is looked upon by Catholics as a part of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, as it is revealed through the Incarnation, and recognised also in Scripture. They ask for her intercession with her divine Son, as we should plead for the prayers of those whom we love when we are in trouble. But I do not think it rests with them on logic or development, but on the order of divine facts. Next after the love and veneration which the Apostles paid to their divine Lord was the love and veneration they paid to His Mother; and this domestic affection, as I may call it, in the family of God, has descended, by a living tradition of heart and mind, to this day. The Incarnation, which made the Son of God our Brother, made His Father our Father, and His Mother our Mother. True, though supernatural, relations exist between us and her; and relations impose *duties* and elicit *affections*. It is, however, a great and difficult mystery still. St. Eucherius exclaims: "If you would try to realise how great is the Mother, think how great is the Son;" and St. Anselm: "To proclaim this alone of the Blessed Virgin, that she is the *Mother of God*, exceeds every height and name which, after that of God, it is possible to conceive."

This, then, is the Catholic belief on the subject. There is, no doubt, much in the devotions towards her, especially in southern countries, which grate upon one, and appear excessive. "They are," as Dr. Newman says, "suitable for Italy, and not for England." But what I did not understand at first was, that these devotions are not *enjoined* upon any one. They are not matters of *faith*. It is the same with the doctrine of the *Assumption*. It has been believed universally and lineally from the earliest traceable antiquity; and for the following reasons:

1. Corruption is the dishonour which follows sin. The blessed Virgin was "pure" and

free from sin: how should corruption prevail over her? She died,—but the sinless may die, as Jesus did,—and saw no corruption.

2. Jesus took our humanity of her, and deified it in Himself. Is it natural to suppose that she of whom He took that deified manhood should turn into the corruption of the grave?
3. That humanity was raised from the dead and glorified in Him. Is it natural that her body, which was the temple of the Incarnate Word, should be now in the dust, like that of Cain or Jezebel?

But to me the strongest proof was, that at Jerusalem, though her grave is well known and resorted to by thousands of every faith (for even Mussulmans venerate her), her sepulchre is by all allowed to be *empty;* and among all the relics of saints preserved and honoured throughout the world, there are none of *her* but her clothes.

However, as I said before, this is not a *dogma*, or part of the Catholic Faith. No one is compelled to believe it, or would risk salvation by not doing so. The more I see and know of Catholic worship, the more I feel that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin, to come between the soul and its Creator,—that the devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and to Angels and Saints, as little interferes with the mediation of the Redeemer as the love which we bear our friends and relations is inconsistent with that supreme homage to the Unseen, which does but sanctify and exalt what is of earth. What does Faber say in that wonderful and comforting book of his, *The Foot of the Cross?* "Our Blessed Lord was at once our atonement and our example. He redeemed the world solely by His precious Blood. *By His merits alone* are we saved. His prerogatives as our Redeemer are simply *unshared by any one.* His Mother had to be redeemed as well as the rest of us, though in a different way,—by prevention, and not by restoration." And again, speaking of the effect which the use of the rosary should produce, he says: "All these devotions should create in our minds *an extreme tenderness towards our Blessed Lord,* united with the profoundest reverence. This is, in fact, their main object."

The whole tone of this book struck me very much, for this reason: I had a repugnance from reading it, knowing it to be on what Catholics call the "Glories of Mary:"—but I found that it should rather be called the "Glories of Jesus;"

for every argument, every description, led one up, as it were, from the Mother to the Son; and I began for the first time to understand what an old priest once said to me in the East: "You will never really love Jesus till you have learned the devotion to His Mother." Therefore this point has ceased to be a difficulty with me. My reason and common-sense lead me to acquiesce in the belief in her purity, and of the "Second Eve" not being inferior to the first. And with regard to pleading for her intercession with her divine Son, it seems to me equally reasonable to believe that she who was nearest to Him on earth should be nearest to Him in heaven; and that if we beg for the prayers of those on earth whom we love, and in whose holiness we believe, much more should we have confidence in the prayers and intercessions of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin, who in heaven perpetually behold the presence of their Lord.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH.

ITS UNITY. THE MEANING OF DEVELOPMENT.

It seems to me that the one great difference between Catholics and Anglicans is in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

1. Both believe that the Holy Spirit came on the Day of Pentecost, and that He is to abide in the world to the end.
2. Both believe that the office of the Holy Spirit is to illuminate and sanctify the soul.

But the Catholic Church believes and teaches more than this. We see in Holy Scripture:

1. That the Father sent the Son into the world to redeem it; and that when the Son had ascended, the Father and the Son sent the Holy Ghost to abide in this world for ever; that is, that when the Second Person of the Holy Trinity had finished His work and ascended, the Third Person came to take it up and carry it on for ever.

2. That though the Son was in the world before the Incarnation, yet He came then in a new way, and for a new work; and that likewise, though the Holy Spirit was in the world before the day of Pentecost, yet He came on that day in a new way, and for a new work.

3. That before the Day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit dwelt in *individuals.* Since that day, He dwells also in the *mystical Body* of Christ. Therefore St. John says: "The Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

4. That before the Incarnation the *mystical*

Body of Christ did not *exist*, and that it was first fully formed when our Blessed Lord, the Head, ascended into heaven. (See Eph. i. 19 and 23; and iv. 4-16.)

5. That from the Day of Pentecost to this hour there has been "One Body and One Spirit;" that is, the One Universal Church, the dwelling-place and the organ of the Spirit of Truth.

From all these plain truths of Holy Scripture the following conclusions are arrived at:

1. That the Holy Spirit is the perpetual and divine Teacher upon earth.
2. That the One Universal Church is the organ of His voice. Whatsoever, therefore, the One Universal Church teaches is the voice of the Spirit of God, and therefore infallibly true.

Therefore:

That if we believe truly the office of the Holy Spirit, we must believe in the infallibility of the Church; and that if we do not believe in the infallibility of the Church, we cannot believe truly the office of the Holy Spirit.

To sum up the above:

The office of the Holy Spirit is not only to give clear conceptions of the original Revelation, but:

1. To preserve and perpetuate those conceptions in the Church.
2. To assist the Church in the enumeration of those conceptions.
3. To guide the Church in discerning what is the original Revelation, in the midst of errors which often simulate truth.
4. To define in more explicit terms the doctrines assailed by heresy.
5. To extinguish private judgment by a perpetual and Divine authority, proclaiming the original Revelation, and all appeals to Scripture or antiquity by the perpetual and living Divine Voice of the Holy Spirit, the author of the original Revelation. In one word, to sustain and prolong the illumination of the Day of Pentecost to the end of the world.

All appeals to antiquity against the voice of the Church at this hour have:

1. Their origin in private judgment.
2. Their legitimate result in rationalism, because they deny the perpetuity of a Divine Voice, speaking always as at the beginning.

You will say: "But we have the Scriptures. We go by the Bible." Listen to what St. Ambrose says on this head:

"Learn that Satan often sets a snare for the faithful by means of the Divine Scriptures themselves."

St. Jerome: "The science of the Scriptures is the only one which all persons indiscriminately claim as theirs." And again: "Neither let sectarians feel satisfied with themselves when they seem to prove what they affirm by portions of the Scriptures, since even the devil quoted the Sacred Writings; and the Scriptures consist not in being read, but in being understood."

St. Hilary: "Remember that there is no heretic who does not now assert that he utters *according to Scripture* the things wherein he blasphemes. All plead Scripture without the mind of the Scripture; and unbelieving plead belief."

Tertullian: "Thy faith hath made thee whole, not thy exercise in the Scriptures. Who shall understand the marrow of Scripture but the school of Christ itself, namely, the Church, which is set as a master over us, to teach us all things?"

But St. Augustine is stronger than all the rest. He exclaims: "I would not believe the Gospel itself, unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."

I could fill pages with similar extracts; from which it clearly follows that the custom of the

Church from the earliest ages is to approve the faith in two ways:

1. By the authority of Scripture.
2. By the tradition of the Church.

Not because the canon of Scripture alone is not sufficient of itself for all things, but because men, interpreting the divine words according to their own pleasure, conceive various opinions and errors; and for this cause it is necessary that the interpretation of Scripture be directed according to the one rule of the ecclesiastical sense, which is directed by the Spirit of God.

I will conclude this portion of my subject by a quotation from Bossuet's letter to M. Claude, the Calvinist minister, which ends as follows: "There was no time when a visible and speaking authority did not exist, to which submission was due. Before Jesus Christ, that authority among the Jews was in the synagogue: when the synagogue was on the point of failing, Jesus Christ Himself appeared; and when He ascended, He left a Church, and with it His Holy Spirit. Tell me that Jesus once more appears on earth, teaching, preaching, and working miracles, I want this Church no longer. But if you take her from me, again I must have Jesus Christ in person, speaking, instructing, deciding by miracles and with an unerring authority. 'But has He not left,' you say, 'His written Word?' He has; a Word holy and adorable; but it is a Word which may be handled and expounded as fancy shall direct—a Word that remains silent under every interpretation. When difficulties and doubts arise, then we must have some external guide that shall solve those difficulties and satisfy our doubts, and that guide must be unerring."

The history of every doctine will show that *gradual* explicitness has been the condition of its expression. Almost every doctrine will thus show three periods:

1. Of implicit consciousness in the mind of the Church.
2. Controversy as to its explicit statement.
3. Definite and final expression.

The expression "Trinity," for instance, is not found before A.D. 200. As to *substance*, St. Peter, St. John, and the rest, believed the same as it is expressed in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; but as to conception of doctrine and its *expression*, we learn of the Church what years of heresy and conflict with heresy had *developed*. This is the sole and only sense of the much-abused word *development*. The notion that it signifies either increase of the *quantity* revealed, or in the number of revealed truths, is an error from want of theological knowledge or clearness of apprehension. The Church affirms development in the sense I have given, and rejects all other under anathema. (Vide St. Thomas Aquinas, and other Catholic authorities.) But to return to my original subject. The dispute between the Churches is in reality not of this doctrine or of that, but in the belief in "*one Fold, under one Shepherd,*" one Church, one Truth, one Divine Voice. This excludes, or rather is superior to, all other questions. No organisation is sufficient which is out of *unity*. "The Church of God is *one*," says Gelasius: "one is the Church in heaven; the same also upon earth; and in this Church the Spirit abides for ever." And St. Cyprian: "God is one, and Christ one, and the Church one, and the Chair one founded by the Lord's Word *upon a rock*. There shall be *one* flock. How, then, can he who is not of the number of the flock be reckoned *in* the flock?" "He can no longer have God for a Father who has not the Church for a Mother. The Spouse of Christ is His Church. She owns but one home. She keeps us for God." "He who holds not this unity, holds not the law of God; holds not the faith of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; holds not life or salvation; because

Christ's Church cannot be rent. His tunic, the emblem of the Church, was not divided by those to whom it fell. Whatsoever, then, is parted from the body cannot live in a state of separation; it loses thereby the very principle of health." And St. Irenæus: "Who are they who rend and divide, and, as far as in them lies, destroy the great and glorious body of Christ? For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every grace; and the Spirit is truth." Again, St. Ignatius: "I exhort you to concur in the mind of God and of Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, that there be one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope, one love in His Body, which is the Church."

I will quote no more. All rivers run into the sea, and all truths run at last into this one,—the Alpha and Omega of the Faith,—to which all Protestants demur.

The divine Revelation of Christianity, the Inspiration of Scripture, and the Infallible Voice which guides the Church, are the three truths on which depend the unity of the glorious Body of Christ; and upon this faith depends the salvation of those who see it, and to whom His Holy Spirit alone can reveal it.

THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER'S CHAIR.

But closely connected with the subject on which I wrote last is the question of the Supremacy of St. Peter's Chair. It is one of the subjects on which English people are the hottest. "The Pope, the Devil, and the Pretender," were the bugbear of our ancestors, and it virtually is so still. Mr. * * * *, in some long but very kind letters, which he wrote to me last year on the subject of the two Churches, dwelt specially on this point, asserting "that such a supremacy has been *developed* in the Western Church, and that it was neither recognised in the first four centuries nor in the Athanasian period." Now, I will leave out the evidence from Holy Scripture of the peculiar and separate charge given by our Lord to St. Peter, *apart and distinct from* the rest of the Apostles. I leave out the proofs in the Acts of the Apostles, quoted so largely by Passaglia, of his having been at once admitted and received by the Church as their head. I will take Mr. * * * *'s own standing-ground, which, on inquiry, I found completely disproved. In the second century, St. Irenæus writes: "To Rome it is necessary that every Church resort, in which great and glorious

Chair has been preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles."

Tertullian: "For if thou thinkest heaven is closed, remember that our Lord left here the keys thereof to St. Peter, and through him to the Church."

Origen: "On Peter, as on the earth, was the Church founded, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail."

St. Cyprian: "There is one Baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church, founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter, for an origin or principal of unity."

St. Ambrose: "They have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's Chair: therefore, where Peter is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there death is not, but life eternal."

St. Chrysostom: "He intrusted to his hand (Peter) the Primacy over the universal Church. And should any one say, 'Why, then, did James receive the throne of Jerusalem?' this is my answer: that He appointed this man Peter not teacher of that throne only, but of the whole habitable globe."

At the beginning of the Arian heresy, Pope Julius summoned St. Athanasius, together with his opponents, to appear at Rome; which summons *St. Athanasius obeyed.*

St. Basil addressed an earnest appeal to the Pope to come and settle the many and grievous disputes in the Eastern Church: and St. Ambrose again, writing to the Pope Siricius, says: "We have recognised in the letter of your Holiness the watchfulness of the good shepherd who does faithfully guard the fold of Christ."

Again, St. Jerome: "As the East, vexed with internal discord, is tearing into shreds the seamless garment of the Lord, therefore have I felt that I must consult the Chair of Peter. Following no chief but Christ, I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. Upon that rock I know that the Church is built. Whosoever eats the Lamb out of this house is profane. If any be not in this Ark of Noah, he will perish whilst the deluge prevaileth. Whosoever gathereth not with thee, scattereth; whosoever is not of Christ is Antichrist. Meanwhile I cry aloud, 'If any one be united to the Chair of Peter, he is mine.' Wherefore I beseech your holiness that you would make known to me with whom I ought to hold communion in Syria."

And again, St. Chrysostom: "Why did Christ shed His Blood? That He might obtain possession of those very sheep which He intrusted to Peter, and his successors after him."

I will only give one more quotation, from St. Augustine, though I might multiply them *ad infinitum.*

The Council of Carthage had made application to Rome as follows: "We have considered that what has been done by us must be made known to your Holiness, that to the decrees made by our lowliness might be added the authority of the Apostolic See." St. Augustine, after declaring that when submitted thus to the Chair of Peter "*the affair was settled,*" adds: "for with the Roman Church is the authority in which the primacy of the Apostolic Chair has always been in force."

I will not quote any later Fathers, as they would be irrelevant to my purpose, which is to prove that this supremacy is not a "*modern development.*" Neither was it the main cause of the Greek schism, which was brought about by the ambition of Photius and the political intrigues of Constantinople. That the Greeks acknowledged the supremacy of Rome up to 869 A.D. is a matter of history. Eight great Ecumenical Councils had been held up to that time, which were all held in the East; and, as M. Guizot adds, "by Bishops of the East, under the influence of Emperors of the East, the Papal Legates being often the only Westerns present." Yet in their decisions they always put in the saving clause: "Reserved for the confirmation and authority of St. Peter's Chair." And the seventh Council, rejecting a previous one, says: "How was it legal? for it had not the countenance of the Roman Pontiff, "*as the Law of Councils requires;*" and of another heretical assembly it is said: "They have dared hold a council without the authority of the Apostolic See, which never was lawful, and never has been done." And again: "For we cannot, without the consent of the Bishop of the Roman Church, hear causes of faith. We await therefore the sentence of your Apostolic Throne," &c.

"Out of the Twelve Apostles is one selected," says St. Jerome, "that by the appointment of a head the occasion of schism may be taken away." And St. Augustine, after a magnificent defence of the Church against heresy, bursts out with: "In the Catholic Church, the agreement of peoples and of nations keeps me; an authority begun with miracles, nourished with hope, increased with charity, confirmed by antiquity, keeps me;

the Succession of Priests from the Chair itself of the Apostle Peter, unto whom the Lord, after His resurrection, committed His sheep to be fed, down even to the present Pope, keeps me; finally, the name itself of the Catholic Church keeps me—a name which, in the midst of so many heresies, *this Church alone has obtained.* So that, though all heretics would fain have called themselves, and do call themselves, "Catholics," yet, to the inquiry of any stranger, 'Where is the meeting of the Catholic Church held?' they dare not point to their own churches or house."

Perhaps you will think that I have all this time forgotten the claim of the Anglican Church to the Apostolical Succession. Some one or two among the numerous Catholic authorities grant it; the majority deny it. But I have always felt this difficulty: that at the very best it must be a matter of the most serious doubt whether there are any Anglican Priests at all. It is a matter of history that when the supreme jurisdiction of St. Peter's See was transferred to the Crown, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, the Primacy was vacant, and sixteen Bishops alone survived. Of these, fifteen refused to accept the new oath, and were deposed. One only, Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, accepted the conditions offered by the

Crown, and retained his See. But, to my mind, it appears irrelevant to the great question at issue whether the English clergy have the Succession or not. There is no doubt that the Donatists had the Apostolic Succession, yet they were condemned as heretics. And again: the Nestorians have valid orders, yet are schismatics. In each case the unity of the Church Catholic was broken; and by their separation from the great body of the Church they forfeited the rights and privileges of its children. It is a favourite argument with my Anglican friends, "that it was not *they* who made the schism, but the Church of Rome, who, by her additions and superstitions, had departed from the faith of the early Church, to which, at the Reformation, Anglicans returned." How they can by any possibility reconcile the teaching of St. Augustine or St. Ambrose with the Thirty-nine Articles, I leave it for them to discover.

In answer to the argument put forth the other day to me by Count * * * *, that "the hatred of Englishmen to the Pope arose from their dread of his interference with their civil liberties and the rights of the Crown," I will here give an extract of the Catholic law on these points, as laid down in the "Propositions" I have before mentioned:

Proposition XV.

"Nor do Catholics believe that the Pope has any direct or indirect authority over the temporal concerns of states or the jurisdiction of princes. Hence, should the Pope attempt to dispense with any sovereign's subjects from their allegiance, such dispensations they would view as frivolous and null."

Proposition XVI.

"It is a primary truth in the Catholic religion that no license can be given to men to lie, to forswear or perjure themselves, to massacre their neighbours, or disturb their country, on pretence of promoting the Catholic cause or religion: furthermore, they believe that all pardons or dispensations granted, or pretended to be granted, in order to such ends or designs, could have no other effect than to add sacrilege and blasphemy to the above crimes."

ON JUSTIFICATION.

Mr. * * * * once said to me: "This is the weak point of the Catholics, and the one on which the great difference between the Churches turns." I will not, therefore, in this paper do as I have done in the others, *i. e.* quote the authority of the Fathers of the first four or five centuries, because he would look upon them as confirming the Anglican view of the matter, which he thinks is not the actual one of the Catholic Church in the present day. I will, therefore, begin with St. Bernard, and his famous book on *Grace and Free Will,* which I brought with me here to read up the subject. It was called forth by the following circumstance: He was talking one day to his brethren upon the marvellous effects of grace, and added, in a tone of deep thankfulness, "that grace had always prevented him in good;" and that "all good owes to grace its beginning, its progress, and its perfection." One of his listeners answered: "If grace does every thing, what will be our reward? where our merits? where our hope?" St. Bernard replied: "What! do you think to be the author of your merits, or to save yourself by your own good works; you, who cannot even pronounce the name of Jesus without the grace of the Holy Spirit? Have you forgotten the words of Him who said, '*Without Me* ye can do nothing'? It dependeth not on him that willeth or on him that runneth, but on God, who showeth mercy. But if you ask me, 'What then becomes of our free will?' I reply:

'It shows us how we can work out our salvation.'"

This conversation made St. Bernard determine to write something on the subject; and thus he produced what has been called *The Golden Book.* I can only give a very short summary of it here.

He first lays down, with St. Augustine, "that every good action supposes the coöperation of the human will with divine grace, and that the work of salvation cannot, therefore, be accomplished without the concurrence of these two things, *grace* and *freedom*—grace, which gives; freedom, which receives, which acquiesces, which consents: so that to work out our salvation is to consent to grace. "Thus, of ourselves we will; but it is of grace that we will what is good." It would be too long for me to copy a hundredth part of the argument. I will, therefore, only add one more extract.

"O man, when non-existing, thou couldst not create thyself; a sinner, thou couldst not justify thyself; dead, thou couldst not raise thyself to life: no one can doubt these truths, except he be ignorant of the justice of God, and seek to establish his own. And who is ignorant of the justice of God? He who attributes to himself any merits but those which proceed from grace. You will ask, then, 'What is the use of good works?' There are three things which contribute to the renewing of the inward man—a right intention, pure affections, and good deeds. But inasmuch as it is the Holy Spirit who works these good dispositions in us, they are the gifts of God; in so far, on the other hand, as they require the consent and concurrence of our will, they are, by God's free mercy, imputed to us as merit. To sum up all in one word, with St. Paul: 'Whom He called, them He also justified; whom He justified, them He also glorified.'"

But I will leave St. Bernard and his grand work, which seems to me to exhaust the subject, and go to a work entitled *Roman-Catholic Principles*, published in the reign of Charles II.:

1. "When man has sinned, the remission or pardon of sin is not attainable by him otherwise than in and by the merits of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, who freely purchased our ransom."
2. "It is only through the same merits of Jesus Christ that the just man can obtain either an increase of holiness in this life or eternal happiness in the next."
3. "The good works of a just man, proceeding

> from grace and charity, are so far acceptable to God, through His great goodness and sacred promises, as to be truly deserving of reward, *God crowning His own gifts* when He crowns the good works of His servants."

Again, in a work by the Rev. James Waterworth, entitled *The Faith of Catholics,* precisely the same views are laid down, and that from irrefragable authority. But I will conclude with the end of the declaration on this subject by the Council of Trent.

"Although in the Sacred Scriptures so much be so absolutely attributed to good works, that Christ promises that even he that 'shall give a drink of cold water to one of His little ones shall not be without his reward;' and that the Apostle testifies that 'what is but a light and momentary tribulation here, works in us an exceeding weight of glory in heaven;' nevertheless, God forbid that a Christian should either trust or glory in himself and not in the Lord, *of whose bounty alone it is* that the things which are His gifts should be reckoned as our merits." In what is this doctrine different from that of the English Church?

MIRACLES AND RELICS.

There is one other subject on which I wish to say a few words, and that is on the subject of Miracles. Catholics believe that they happen in any age of the Church, though not for the same purposes or in the same number as in Apostolic times; that what God did once He is likely to do again, in His own time and way, to confirm the faith and stop the mouths of unbelievers. Protestants, on the other hand, flatly disbelieve in them, affirm that they are "*all false,*" and lay down as a kind of first principle that "*there are no miracles since the days of the Apostles.*" If you point to the tradition of the Church from the earliest times, they will reply: "Oh, yes, of course; it is their whole system of priestcraft. Clever men must see through the humbug. Those who don't are women and fools. But they keep it up, those priests, *because it pays.*" Who has not heard the changes rung on this theme a hundred times? And yet these very people will believe in mesmerism, in spirit-rappers, in every conceivable "spiritualism," *except* that of the Catholic Church. Now, I will not go through the evidence of the first three or four centuries of the belief on this head, but skip at once to St.

Augustine, who is recognised as an authority by most Englishmen, and who certainly was neither "a woman nor a fool."

St. Ambrose was anxious to find some relics for the altar of his new Basilica at Milan, and discovered the bodies of the martyrs St. Protasius and St. Gervasius, which he translated thither. St. Augustine, describing the scene, says: "*I was there. I was at Milan. I knew and saw the miracles done.* God testified visibly to the power of His Saints. A blind man, very well known to the city, begged to be allowed to draw near and touch with his handkerchief the bodies of the martyrs, which, when he had done, he put it to his eyes, and *they were forthwith opened.* He had been led there; he came back without a guide, rejoicing! *The whole town knew of this miracle, and saw it with us.* The man himself lived ever after in that Basilica, having dedicated himself at once to the service of God." And he goes on: "And if you ask, 'Why were these miracles wrought?' I reply: 'That the world, through them, might believe. For God, by performing miracles from the bodies of His Saints, furnishes a sure testimony that what is dead perishes not to Him, inasmuch as He adorns the ex-animate flesh with the effect of His divinity.'"

And again: "Interrogate those who are cured by the martyrs, and learn to how many afflictions they vouchsafe remedies. The dust alone is seen; but the benefits to those who approach with faith are incalculable." I will not multiply quotations or examples. That miracles have been wrought by Saints in all ages is my firm belief. That they are very rare *now* is, I believe, equally true, for "the love of many has waxed cold." When I was at Rome in 1862, an English lawyer was given some papers to look over regarding the miracles of a person who was supposed to have died in the odour of sanctity. He returned them, after having looked them over, saying: "Well, if all the histories of your Saints are as well authenticated as these appear to me to be, I should no longer disbelieve in miracles." The Cardinal, to whom he was giving back the papers, smiled, and said: "Well, we are not so credulous as you. We don't think the evidence strong enough, and therefore the case is rejected." To the accusation that relics are "absurdly multiplied," St. Gregory exclaims: "Well-nigh the whole earth is blessed with these hallowed remains. A little dust, a small portion of hair, a shred of rag, a stain of blood, was enough; for the power of healing is not less in the particles than in the whole body."

It is not in vain, therefore, that such veneration is shown by the Church, God having so manifested His power to those that believe.

LIFE AND CATHOLICITY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CONVERTS.

As to "life" in the Church of England, which an Anglican Bishop once gave me as a proof of its being in the right, it is simply no proof at all. There is "life" among the Wesleyans and the Moravians and the Free Kirk. The missions of the two first are infinitely more successful than those of the Church of England. There is "life," terrible life and vitality and strength, in that horrible Mohammedan delusion which has been allowed, by the mysterious design of Providence, to overrun half Asia and Africa. Therefore *life* is no sign of *truth*. I am afraid I shall make my Anglican friends very angry if I express my conviction that, as far as their foreign missions are concerned, in spite of the vast machinery and resources at their command, the English Church is, in most cases, a failure. I can only judge by what I see and hear. Lady * * * * wrote to me from India the most melancholy letters on the subject; and she had the best opportunities for knowing the truth, and every bias to judge otherwise, had it been possible. From Australia I have similar accounts. I was myself a witness to their entire failure in Egypt and Syria. We breakfasted one morning at Mr. * * * *'s, to meet an Abyssinian missionary; and Lord * * * * at last summoned up courage to ask him what success had attended his labours. He confessed that he did not think he had made above *one* convert! Last year, in going from Alexandria to Jaffa, we met the Catholic Bishop of Central Africa, who, with some black Priests, was going to Jerusalem for Easter. The centre of his diocese was Abyssinia, in which country he had lived and laboured for twenty years, founding schools and establishing missions in every direction, which had been blessed with great success. He told me that he always went *on foot* through his diocese (though he is past seventy), and lived in the native way, in the native huts. But this is foreign to my subject. Let any one who wants the account of a Catholic mission read the life of St. Francis Xavier; or go to the Lebanon, and see what work is being done there.

I do not think you are likely to imagine that

I for one moment doubt the work of God's Holy Spirit in the souls of those who remain in the Anglican Church. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is, "that no penitent soul can perish, and no one that loves God can be lost." Therefore, no doubt would be cast upon the reality of the work of grace in the Church of England by being convinced that her position is untenable and schismatical, and that her best and most earnest children will, some day, come to think so too. To those who, knowing no better, believe in her system, and act up to that belief (and there are thousands of such), God may supply all that is necessary to salvation. It is those who *doubt* who are not safe within her pale; still more, those who are as thoroughly convinced as I am of the truth of an opposite system—"for whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

You must not fancy either that I have deluded myself with the idea that I shall find "perfection" in the Church of Rome. The Church, as the expression of the Divine Voice, is *in itself perfect;* but its members are formed of human materials, and, as such, must partake of evil and imperfections. But on the principal points of faith I find in the Catholic Church an accord which exists nowhere else. What is the state of the Church of England at this moment as to unity of doctrine, authority in teaching, and faith in the Divine Voice? Do the Bishops of Salisbury and Carlisle hold *one* view alike as regards the Sacraments? Are not the Articles framed purposely with ambiguity, so as to embrace at one and the same time Puritans and semi-Romanists? But the truth is *one.*

Mr. * * * * implores me to look upon the Anglican as only "another portion" of the Catholic Church. If this be so, where is the sin of going to the "Roman portion"? If there be any sin in it, then the Church of England is not in the same unity and truth. A perfect aqueduct brings no water if the one arch which connects it with the spring-head be broken.

Again, a great deal is now said and hoped for by the Bishop of * * * *, and others, about union with the Greek Church. I do not think that one who has been in the East can ever believe that this will come about; because our people, especially the middle class in England, are essentially Protestant, and the Greek Church is all that is most opposed to "Protestantism;" even more so than the Latin. The only possible point of union is hatred of the Pope; and that, you must allow, is a negative and not a positive view. Neither do I believe that the most eminent among the Greek Church are disposed to favour the idea of such a union. The Patriarch of Constantinople not only refused to receive the Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar *as such*, when I was there last year, but would not return his visit, in spite of a remonstrance from the English ambassador, looking upon him simply as a schismatic with no valid orders. Certainly, if the Bishop of * * * *, next spring, goes there, as he proposes, to try and bring about this union, he must begin by burning his sermon on "Mariolatry;" for in no Church is there such a "cultus" of the Blessed Virgin as in the Greek.

It seems to me a dream to call a communion "Catholic," when one can neither appeal to any clear statement of Catholic doctrine in its formularies nor interpret ambiguous formularies by the received and living Catholic sense, whether past or present. The Reformation destroyed the divine authority of the Church in England, and thus, by rendering all discipline impossible, has introduced the laxity, schism, and evils of a moral and practical kind, which all earnest thinking people mourn over in vain. Every one must feel that men of Catholic views are too truly a party in the English Church. I have myself heard a

High-Church English clergyman say, "If our practices and belief were *known*, it would be impossible for us to remain here." Is this honest or straightforward? If they were really the views of the Church of England, would they be obliged to hide them?

I have heard Dr. Manning and his friends very much abused for the way in which they have what is called "turned round" upon the Church of England, their original mother, and been "more bitter" against her than old Roman Catholics themselves. As to "personal" bitterness, I know as a fact that it is entirely opposed to the temper of his (Dr. M.'s) mind; but as to believing in the Church of England as a "Branch of the Catholic Church," when it distinctly repudiates, or only partially holds, the most important articles of the Catholic Faith, not only Dr. Manning, but all Catholics must feel it to be impossible. When once Catholic truth has become a reality to one, the other disappears and becomes a mere "National Institution," as Dr. Newman calls it.

I have always marvelled why it is that, either in politics or religion, a "*convert*" is held in such utter abhorrence in England. Every one says: "If you had been born or brought up so and so, it would have been another matter." "If Peel had been all his life a free-trader, I could have forgiven him," said a Derbyite to me only yesterday. "If you had been brought up a Roman Catholic, I could understand it," said * * * * to me two years ago; "but a *pervert* I can't abide." Must one, then, persist in what one feels is error, however overwhelming may be one's convictions? Must one all one's life *act a lie?* Is it not more noble, more honourable, more like an Englishman, to say openly before the whole world: "I believed so and so for a long time. I had been brought up in those views; by and by I began to doubt their truth. I now feel I was wrong; and whatever it may cost me, I will own it bravely." I asked Mr. * * * *, the All-Saints' preacher, why he was not satisfied to remain at All Saints', where, it appeared to me, he had every thing which a Catholic mind could desire. He replied: "*Because it was not honest.*" This is exactly what I have felt for years.

But then the world exclaims: "Who are the converts to the Church of Rome? Weak and foolish persons: notoriously so. Silly women; girls whose heads are turned by the gewgaws and finery, and music and "functions" of the gorgeous Roman ritual. Weak-minded young clergymen, whose bishops won't allow them to wear Roman collars, or dress as monks, and play at Popery; or poor ignorant people who know no better; or great sinners, who think to cheat their consciences by joining a Church which allows them to sin with impunity, provided they come and confess it." Or if a man like Dr. Newman goes, of whom they cannot say such things, and whom they must allow to be more able than hardly any one in this generation, they take refuge in Mr. * * * *'s expression: "Misled by the idiosyncrasy of his genius." Or in Mr. * * * *'s of Dr. Manning: "Blinded by a dream of impossible unity." Then follows the assertion of their consequent "deterioration of character;" they have "lost their sense of honour and of truth;" or else "they are restless, unhappy, and dissatisfied, and would come back if it were not for very shame," &c. &c. When will this sort of talk cease? When will Englishmen judge without preconceived prejudices?

I came the other day on an old *Westminster Review*, of January 1851, and hit upon the following words, not certainly written by a friendly hand, and which I see Dr. Newman was also struck with, and has quoted in one of his books:

"Few, even of educated Englishmen, have any suspicion of the depth and solidity of the Catholic dogma; its wide and various adaptation to wants ineffaceable from the human heart; its wonderful fusion of the supernatural into the natural life; its powerful hold upon the conscience. It is not among the ignorant and vulgar, but among the intellectual and imaginative; not by appeals to the senses in worship, but by consistency and subtlety of thought, that, in our days, converts will be made to the Roman Church. When a thoughtful man, accustomed to defer to historical authority, and competent to estimate moral theories as a whole, is led to penetrate beneath the surface, he is unprepared for the sight of so much speculative grandeur; and if he have been a mere Anglican or Lutheran, is perhaps surprised into the conclusion that the elder system has the advantage in philosophy and antiquity alike."

But I have done. I have written these papers that those who care for me may see that I have not hastily, nor without due care and study and deliberation, arrived at my present convictions. "You ought to be able to bring out what you feel and what you mean, as well as to feel and mean it," wrote Dr. Newman.

This is what I have tried to do in this summary of my faith. It is the fruit of two years' reading. I could have done it far better at home, for here I have scarcely any books of reference. But I made copious notes of every book I read bearing upon the subject in question, and these notes I have embodied here: at home I should have had no time to put them together; and besides, I very much wish not to delay any longer the expression of my convictions. I wish, above all things, not to appear to act a double part. Mr. * * * *, writing to me last year, exclaimed: "If you take this step, I shall not be able to cease from feeling love and gratitude towards you, but I can never *respect* you any more." *Be it so.* I accept the issue. I have often felt at * * * *, in the midst of the humiliation of over-praise with which I have been frequently surrounded: "Ah, my good people! if you knew the truth—if you knew the key-note of my life, you would despise me just as much as you now overvalue me." And yet, when the time comes, and all look upon me with contempt, and sorrow, and distrust, and suspicion, I should like to be able to say to them: "Whatever, in former times, you thought in me worthy of esteem or love, I owe it to the Catholicity that was in me." What are tenderness of conscience, watchfulness over little sins, self-denial, devotion to others, but the realisation of the continual presence of God, of the Confessional, of the "Daily Rule," which, thanks be to God, every Catholic is given to help him on in his daily road from earth to heaven? It is not the idea of being "despised" which has kept me back, but the fear of giving pain to so many whom I love, and which I know is inevitable. My whole nature shrinks from it. I have had, too, all along the greatest dread of going by my own feelings, lest they should mislead me; and I feel, as Dr. Newman says in his *Apologia,* "that it is indeed a heavy responsibility to act as I am doing," and that in the struggle "my heart and body and mind are fairly tired out." But my faith does not waver —never has wavered for one moment since I was at Jerusalem. I do not think that any preference for the ritual of the Catholic Church, any charm in its services, any increased help that these services may give to the working of God's grace in one's soul, can justify one in leaving the Church where God's providence has placed one, *if one can believe in it.* But the moment one has been led by God's Spirit to take in the real idea of a Church, one ceases to believe in the Anglican Establishment. It simply *disappears from one's mind.* People talk of the "Church of our Baptism." What Church is that but the Church of our baptismal creed, the one Holy Catholic Church? Our Baptism binds us to *this,* not to the Church of England, except so far as the Church of England is one with the Church Catholic. And if one feels that the Anglican Church is at variance with the Catholic Church, your very Baptism, as it appears to me, binds you to leave it.

I have for years been in the habit of reading every morning Dr. Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints;* and I used often to be struck with the wonderful unity of doctrine and practice which was shown in those lives from the first century to the present. I could not help feeling that many things which I had been taught to look upon as "Roman innovations" had been believed by these men and women from the earliest times; and I had long ago come to the conclusion of Thomas à Kempis: "What Thy Saints believed, I believe; what they hoped, I hope for; and whither they are arrived, I trust that I also, through God's grace, shall arrive."

One assertion of my friends I emphatically deny: "that the fact of my conversion will spread widely the seeds of infidelity and scepticism." How can this be? Do I believe less than I did before? Do I not, on the contrary, believe far more, realise far more the truths which before I only partially believed? This one thing is certain, that the letters of my Anglican friends have done me nothing but harm in *their* sense; for, as Dr. Newman again says, "they made me realise my own views to myself; made me see their consistency; assured me of my own deliberateness; suggested to me traces of a providential hand; took away the pain of disclosure, and relieved me of a heavy secret." In his words, therefore, I will conclude:

"The truest expedience is to answer right out when you are asked; the best prudence is not to be a coward; the most damaging folly, to be found out shuffling; and the first of virtues is to tell the truth and shame the devil."

THE END.

LONDON:
LEVEY AND CO., PRINTERS, GREAT NEW STREET,
FETTER LANE, E.C.